



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/559,092

08/24/2006

Peter Gamon Johns

MSX-104(US)

5957

47670

7590

04/01/2009

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP
400 ATLANTIC STREET , 13TH FLOOR
STAMFORD, CT 06901

EXAMINER

IP, SIKYIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1793

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/01/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/559,092		JOHNS, PETER GAMON	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Sikyln Ip		1793	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/4/09.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 20-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 02/095082 (PTO-1449), GB 2355990 (PTO-1449), or USP 6726877 to Eccles.

WO 02/095082 discloses the features including the claimed Ag based alloy (page 1, lines 25-29 and page 11, lines 29-31). GB 2355990 discloses the features including the claimed Ag based alloy (page 2, lines 8-16 and page 4, lines 20-23). Eccles discloses the features including the claimed Ag based alloy (col. 1, line 27 and col. 2, lines 55-65). Therefore, when prior art compounds essentially "bracketing" the claimed compounds in structural similarity are all known, one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly be motivated to make those claimed compounds in searching for new products

Art Unit: 1793

in the expectation that compounds similar in structure will have similar properties. In re Gyurik, 596 F.2d 1012, 1018, 201 USPQ 552, 557 (CCPA 1979); see In re May, 574 F.2d 1082, 1094, 197 USPQ 601, 611 (CCPA 1978) and In re Hoch, 57 CCPA 1292, 1296, 428 F.2d 1341, 1344, 166 USPQ 406, 409 (1970). As stated in In re Peterson, 315 F.3d 1325, 1329-30, 65 USPQ2d 1379, 1382 (Fed. Cir. 2003), that “A prima facie case of obviousness typically exists when the ranges of a claimed composition overlap the ranges disclosed in the prior art”. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select any portion of range, including the claimed range, from the broader range disclosed in a prior art reference because the prior art reference finds that the prior art composition in the entire disclosed range has a suitable utility. Also see MPEP § 2131.03 and § 2123.

With respect to the alloy property such as resistant to form cracks in claim 20 that are defined in relative terms and conditions which would have been inherently possessed by the alloys of cited references.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 7, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument with respect to instant recited Ge content (1-2 wt.%) in pages 9-10 of instant remarks is noted. Applicant's attention is directed to pasted of references below:

Art Unit: 1793

In a further preferred embodiment, the alloy is a ternary alloy consisting, apart from
 30 impurities and grain refiner, of 92.5% to 96% silver, 0.5% to 2% germanium, and 1% to
 7% copper, by weight of the alloy, together with 1 ppm to 40 ppm boron as grain refiner.

WO 02/095082, page 11,

GB 2355990, abstract,

(57) A silver/copper/germanium alloy comprising a silver content of at least 50% by weight, a germanium
 content of between 0.10 and 2% by weight, an elemental boron content of 100ppm or less and an additive
 content of 2% or less by weight, the remainder principally being copper, the additive content comprising one
 of, or a combination of, tin, antimony, silicon and indium.

, and

55

Accordingly, in a further aspect, this invention resides in
 silver alloy compositions including:

81–99.409% by weight silver;

0.5–6% by weight copper;

60

0.05–5% by weight zinc;

0.02–2% by weight silicon;

0.001–2% by weight boron;

0.01–1.5% by weight indium, and

65

0.01–2.5% by weight germanium.

In a further aspect, this invention resides in silver alloy
 compositions including:

Eccles, col. 2,

As stated in *In re Peterson*, 315 F.3d 1325, 1329-30, 65 USPQ2d 1379, 1382 (Fed. Cir.
 2003), that “A prima facie case of obviousness typically exists when the ranges of a
 claimed composition overlap the ranges disclosed in the prior art”.

Conclusion

The above rejection relies on the reference(s) for all the teachings expressed in
 the text(s) of the references and/or one of ordinary skill in the metallurgical art would
 have reasonably understood or implied from the text(s) of the reference(s). To
 emphasize certain aspect(s) of the prior art, only specific portion(s) of the text(s) have
 been pointed out. Each reference as a whole should be reviewed in responding to the
 rejection, since other sections of the same reference and/or various combination of the
 cited references may be relied on in future rejection(s) in view of amendment(s).

All recited limitations in the instant claims have been met by the rejections as
 set forth above.

Art Unit: 1793

Applicant is reminded that when amendment and/or revision is required, applicant should therefore specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.121; 37 C.F.R. Part §41.37 (c)(1)(v); MPEP §714.02; and MPEP §2411.01(B).

Examiner Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Ip whose telephone number is (571) 272-1241. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 5:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Roy V. King, can be reached on (571)-272-1244.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Sikyin Ip/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793

March 29, 2009